

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/786,963	MORTENSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Phallaka Kik	2825	

All Participants:
Status of Application: pending

 (1) Phallaka Kik.

(3) _____.

 (2) Shreen K. Danamraj (Reg. No. 41,696).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 20 March 2006
Time: 1:30PM
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
 None

Claims discussed:
 1,6-7,9,15,17,23,25,31

Prior art documents discussed:
 None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
 See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In response to the Examiner's indications that claims 1,6-7,9,15,17,23,25,31 have minor informalities problems, Applicant's Representative agrees to the changes in order to overcome the minor informalities and provisionally authorizes the Examiner to amend the claims as given in the attached Examiner's Amendment, because Applicant requires consultation before any changes can be made. The Examiner pointed out that Applicant still has the opportunity to amend the claims as provided for under 37 CFR 1.312, if the amendment is not acceptable to Applicant. Applicant's Representative also pointed out that as per claims 6,7,15,23,31, the wording "the group consisting of" construction refers to the Markus claim, wherein "the group" would not need to be changed to --a group--; however, Applicant's Representative agrees to allow the the change from "the group" to --a group-- as desired by the Examiner to overcome the lack of antecedent basis.